

Since 1955, the Soviet Union has shipped \$2,500 million worth of arms to three continents under easy-term sales programs. It has sent its technicians to train natives in their use, and, in most cases, to remain as military advisors. We spent twice as much in 1 year as they have in 7. But we have not built any democracies, as they have built satellites and near satellites in Cuba, Ghana, Egypt, India, to name a few.

We have been played for suckers while they have cold-bloodedly gone about the business of building a new colonial empire. It is about time we learned you can't buy friendship. If we do not want to build an empire of our own, or at least insist on democracies, then why are we scattering billions of our hard-earned taxes around the world?

Either we must be realistic like the Soviets or not kid ourselves about building prestige that melts, as in Thailand, because we saw fit to try to rescue from communism nearby Cambodia with arms aid.

The House does well to cut this handout.

*file*  
**A Plan for Cuba**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an article entitled "A Plan for Cuba," by William R. Mathews, which appeared in the September 23 issue of the Arizona Daily Star. This comes so close to expressing my feelings on the subject of Cuba, that I want to share it with the other Members of the House.

The article follows:

**A PLAN FOR CUBA**  
(By William R. Mathews)

The recent action of the Senate in passing a resolution that gives the President power to deal with Cuba, reflects the general anxiety of the people of the country over this unhappy affair. As a subject of major interest to the American people it is something that calls for serious and calm thinking. Specifically, we should avoid any rash action, but we should be thinking out plans to bring an end to this spectacle of the Soviets setting up a satellite 92 miles off the coast of Florida.

When we do act, we should act decisively. This means that plans have to be made. As an example, steps should be taken to set up, and subsequently recognize, a Cuban Government-in-exile. The Cuban emigres must agree on a president for such a government, and this president should choose his commander in chief of Cuban exile troops. A program of training should be initiated so that, when the time comes, there will be a Cuban government friendly to us ready to take over, when and if the island is liberated.

This government should have plans for political, social and economic affairs that will command the respect and adherence of the people of Cuba. These plans should be publicized, and backed up by guerrilla harassments within the island. It is vital to find out if the Cuban people want to be liberated, and how willingly they themselves will cooperate.

The chances are that there are not enough emigres available to form a military force strong enough to do the liberating. Therefore, America must supply enough troops to make up the difference along with air and naval forces. It may be necessary to proclaim a blockade, once the invasion is underway.

A blockade is a much more serious matter than most Americans realize. There is no such thing as a "peaceful blockade." A blockade, to be respected, must be effective. The North imposed an effective blockade on the South; the British imposed an effective blockade on Germany during both World Wars.

Consequently, when the United States imposes a blockade on Cuba, it must enforce it by seizing ships that attempt to break it. The chances are the blockade would also apply to the air, and thus the United States would have to shoot down planes that tried to slip through the blockade, or compel them to land at a designated spot.

Our action in Cuba would affect seriously our friends as well as our foes. We must be prepared to defend it before the United Nations. We might recall the U.N. conduct in connection with both Goa and New Guinea. What we do will be most unpopular in Europe as well as in Latin America.

Yet there is one fact that should be kept in mind, and that is, that by militantly protecting our own self-interests, we will command the respect of many nations, who, though they may not admit it publicly, will express their respect by not trying to embarrass us.

Of course the Soviet Union will scream to the heavens, and fumigate and threaten, but the chances are Russia will stop short of provoking hostilities. We Americans might as well realize that, sooner or later, we are going to have to defy the Soviet Union. There never will be a better time than now. There can be much worse times in the future, if we pass up this opportunity.

The idea that we must in the name of peace accept this threat from the Soviet Union with its extension of its system of government to an island 92 miles off our coast, but send our military forces across the Pacific to Vietnam, "to stop communism," does not make sense to the American people.

**The Power Play**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. FRED SCHWENGEL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently a very interesting and worthwhile editorial under the title of "The Power Play" appeared in the Burlington, Iowa, Hawk-Eye. Because I think there is much food for thought for Members of Congress and for all who read the RECORD, in this article, under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye]

**THE POWER PLAY**

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, in a speech observing Constitution Day, pointed to the continuing power struggle between the executive and legislative branches of Government.

This struggle, he said, "is not open and above board. It is more covert than open

and probably more unconscious than conscious.

"It involves the slow but irresistible erosion of the power and authority of Congress as bit by bit the executive power circumscribes and diminishes the range of congressional action."

This struggle does indeed overshadow all the conflicts of Washington, including that of partisan politics. The realization is coming slowly to Americans, that what is evolving is a determination of which branch can best control the Nation's destiny in our fast-moving era. So there is turmoil between the Executive, which often believes it must act without waiting for Congress to make up its mind, and the Congress, which traditionally has been the top dog. And, to a lesser degree, the judiciary has become involved—not through any effort of its own but because the people have gone to the courts as a last resort.

SCHWENGEL's implication, however, that the Executive circumscribes and diminishes congressional action, needs closer examination. And it might be well if SCHWENGEL led his Congressmen into a study of why this situation has come about.

In the first place, most of the new power of the Executive has been handed it by Congress itself. Even this recalcitrant Congress has seen fit to give the President tariff authority the legislators once jealously guarded. The controls granted by Congress spread into all fields—broadcasting, air travel, drugs, tax authority, public health. The power of the Executive in such familiar areas as our military program, foreign policy, agriculture, labor negotiations, has come through congressional action and sanction—not through Executive fiat.

We believe much of this quasi-legislative power in Executive hands is desirable, and inevitable. The world simply moves too fast for Congress.

Which brings us to the consideration which SCHWENGEL, and most Congressmen, blithely ignore: the utter failure of Congress to arouse itself to the responsibilities of its duties today.

Congress, not the executive, has made a pork barrel out of our military program; a political football of agriculture; a vote-getting machine out of public works. Congress has tampered with social security funds, has failed to initiate tax reform, has forced those fighting for civil rights to turn to the Justice Department and the courts.

With it all, Congress among all Government agencies has failed to recognize itself. It preserves an archaic and self-defeating seniority system, which rewards political hacks and blinks at senility among legislators. It commits appalling blunders in planning its own plush office buildings, and, except in rare instances when the public gets alarmed, refuses even to audit the waste of its own Members in travel and political expenses. It stymies our democratic process by getting into such ridiculous arguments as that of the last session, over which house should provide the chairman and the room for conference committees. It works on the Tuesday-Thursday basis, and often has a tough time rounding up a quorum for a vote. It tolerates nepotism, padded expense accounts, and votes itself personal barbershops, free mailing privileges, and cuspidors.

SCHWENGEL calls on educators to take the lead in bringing a better understanding of the Constitution and its system of checks and balances. This is well and good.

But the lessons will ring hollow, unless Congress itself undertakes the same study, and inquires whether its Members are performing as the framers of the Constitution envisioned.

tain categories in the public treasures fed largely by taxes collected from highway users or from tolls paid directly by users. Well-managed authorities have contributed enormously to every type of neglected arterial construction. I admit that unforeseeable inventions and devices and imponderable factors of administration, politics, opposition and chance also have their influence on this accounting, but there is no way of measuring them. So they must be left out. And there's another \$64 question—Since government is the first business of the District, how much will it expand? Nevertheless, in spite of the chancy factors, you come up with a fairly reliable formula which can be translated into specific projects, costs and time schedules.

Let us turn now to a few highway definitions. A parkway is a vehicular ribbon park, restricted to passenger vehicles, protected by zoning and otherwise against access, signs and encroachments, landscaped, with ornamental bridges and lighting, at least 400 feet wide, usually accommodating six but rarely more than eight lanes, with generous cloverleaves and long radii, with occasional turnoffs, parking spaces, overlooks and small parks. An expressway is a mixed traffic automotive restricted artery with many of the aspects and amenities of a parkway, but a superior boulevard rather than a ribbon park. After the expressways come ordinary roads and streets which need no definition and are not part of the basic framework of the region.

The outer loop of a logical, sane, comprehensive program of arterial improvements, adopted some time ago, will be finished in 1964. This program widely and justifiably acclaimed includes an inner loop and radials leading to the major interstate routes of the Federal Highway System in Virginia and Maryland. Forty million dollars of unspent Federal highway aid is available and an equal amount of new money is being apportioned. Congress, however, has withheld appropriation of matching funds. Detailed plans, right-of-way acquisition, tenant relocation and further construction have therefore been arrested for reasons difficult to understand.

It is not in the public interest to delay this program on the theory that an as yet undisclosed and undetermined rapid transit system will make such highway arterials unnecessary or materially alter the projected network. No doubt rapid transit rail systems will be proposed from time to time in the future, but their acceptance and financing are highly problematical because in a city of the size of Washington the initial cost is too great, subsidies are hard to come by and no fare structure can be visualized which will support the system. Meanwhile Washington is a car and bus town and every effort should be directed to the improvement of these conventional, established and popular modes of transit. One of the strongest arguments for the new expressway system is that it will greatly facilitate the movement of traffic.

There has been much agitation recently concerning transportation, that is rails and rubber, accompanied by garbled history, random charges of discrimination, misleading statistics and gloomy prophecies of collapse. Irrepressible conflict between the mobile force and the immovable object facts are that the railroads have not

alerted that generally they have not faced bus, truck and car competition, that they have allowed their equipment to deteriorate, that they have walled when they should have been working, that there is no conflict which sensible people cannot resolve and no head-on collision which is unavoidable. There are locations where rapid transit can be combined with vehicular lanes with the same right-of-way, but not many. No doubt commuter subsidies of some

kind are inevitable, but they should depend on superior rail service after the relative roles of the train, bus, car, and aircraft have been determined by experts concerned only with the truth.

The more alternative highway projects you propose in terms of widening, new routes, layout, bridges and tunnels, the more debate will be encouraged and prolonged, the more numerous the obstacles and the higher the ultimate cost. On the other hand, those who insist on immediate practical remedies, will be charged with arrogance, dogmatism, a closed mind, indifference to human hardships and inconvenience, and putting efficiency above sociology and speed over deliberation.

Perhaps you may be able to find or develop some engineering Chesterfields and Machiavellis, smooth in approach and tough in the clinches, who will steer a placid middle course between the builder and the antiquarian. These Chesterfields and Machiavellis must be endowed with just the right mixture of toughness and sentiment, sugar and vinegar, protocol and informality, manners and vitality, charm and force to conquer all enemies without blood, sweat, toil, and tears. Such paragons have never in my experience been around when the going was rough.

Let us now consider some of the details of arterial improvements in the congested city center. Public opinion and light and air suits and damages won't allow you to go up except on an independent right-of-way acquired by condemning a minimum of a hundred feet next to the present street or within blocks. This is practical in a good many cases and has the added advantage of providing continuous offstreet parking. In some instances at strategic central areas you are driven underground, which means heavy expense, ventilation of some kind, easements, and additional acquisitions at some crossings. That's the task we faced at the U.N. headquarters in New York where all the solutions had to be used. We used them. The scheme works.

Another problem which must be taken in stride involves the relocation of tenants before clearing rights-of-way and proceeding with actual construction. This puzzle is old. In New York and some other cities we successfully relocated many tenants after World War II. We adopted a program providing for the rehabilitation of substitute apartments, moving of houses and apartments, moving of eligible families into public and quasi-public housing, and cash payments to reimburse families and small businesses able to find substitute accommodations. Practically every device designed to provide decent, sanitary new quarters for families in the path of public improvements was used. More recently relocation has been slowed down by politics and the timidity of elected officials. Today in many communities the tenant relocation issue has become a prime device to hold up public works programs. We badly need officials prepared to meet this problem honestly and courageously and to spend reasonable amounts to bring about orderly relocation of families and businesses. They must brave criticism and threats of reprisals in the process, but they will be respected in the end.

There are unusual difficulties in the way of carrying out a public works program in Washington. The municipal government is not elected but appointed. The budget is dependent upon Congress, and numerous agencies have what amounts to not only a voice, but a veto. The city of Washington deserves home rule. Nevertheless I have always believed that with first-rate men any organization can be made to function, regardless of law and organization charts.

That's about all I have time for. There is nothing new or original in these observations. The planning problems of a proud National

Capital are to be approached with modesty, detachment, and perspective. It is unlikely that any wholly new concept can be unveiled before an audience which has been saturated with statistics and programs and impressed if not overwhelmed by the array of distinguished names prominently associated with them.

I make no claim to close acquaintance with the District of Columbia and its environs. A national capital is different from an ordinary urban complex. This much I am sure of—that your regional problems will yield only to a rather modest program of limited objectives based not upon statistics, graphs, and logarithms but upon sound judgment of anticipated growth and change, a program pursued relentlessly and fearlessly by tough-minded, well-muscled, alligator-skinned builders who have marshaled enough official and public support to weather temporary opposition, who have a long life expectancy and a hell of a lot of luck.

### Foreign Aid Slash

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the other body works on its version of the foreign aid appropriation bill and in anticipation of the conference that will follow, I think it essential that Members take into account the grassroots public view on the size of our foreign aid appropriation.

Editorial comment across the country has obviously been mixed, but few people question the need for some economy in our foreign aid spending. An exceptionally vigorous editorial on the subject of the House action in reducing the foreign aid appropriation appeared in the Tuesday, September 25, issue of the Chicago Daily Calumet, which I insert into the RECORD at this point.

#### FOREIGN AID SLASH

The House Appropriations Committee's slash of \$1,124 million in the authorized \$4,752 million foreign aid bill brought President Kennedy from his family vacation in Rhode Island to take personal charge of the administration's counteroffensive to try to restore the cut and get the full amount out of Congress.

With all due respect, the House Appropriations Committee disagrees with the President and his demands, and so do millions of Americans who are tired of pouring billions down the drain, only to get ingratitude and even slaps in the face for their trouble.

Take India, one of the biggest beneficiaries of American aid, which votes consistently with the Communist bloc in the United Nations; Poland, which is part of the Communist bloc, and shows no signs of lifting its shackles on its own people; Yugoslavia, whose independent communism is meaningless so long as she votes with the rest of the bloc; China, where the U.S. efforts to build a dam that will industrialize the country has not stopped its drift to a dictatorship of the left; even Thailand, to which we rushed troops recently when it was menaced from Laos, is complaining because we are also helping neighboring Cambodia.

The list is almost endless.